R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 518 AL 001 298

GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEGRO PRESCHOOL CHILD.

BY- BARATZ, JOAN C. POVICH, EDNA

PUB DATE JUN 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.28 30P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LANGUAGE RESEARCH, *NEGRO DIALECTS, NEGROES, NONSTANDARD DIALECTS, LOWER CLASS, CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, *PRESCHOOL CHILDREN, LANGUAGE TESTS, ETHNIC GROUPS, PRESCHOOL TESTS, VERBAL ABILITY, SPEECH EVALUATION, STANDARD SPOKEN USAGE, TRANSFORMATIONS (LANGUAGE), KERNEL SENTENCES, SYNTAX, SENTENCE STRUCTURE, ENGLISH, DEVELOPMENTAL SENTENCE TYPES,

LANGUAGE SAMPLES OF 20 NEGRO HEAD START CHILDREN IN WASHINGTON, D.C., WERE ANALYZED USING LEE'S (1966) DEVELOPMENTAL SENTENCE TYPES MODEL. THE TRANSFORMATIONS AND RESTRICTED FORMS OF THESE CHILDREN WERE THEN COMPARED WITH THE RESULTS THAT MENYUK (1964) OBTAINED FOR MIDDLE CLASS PRESCHOOLERS. RESULTS INDICATE THAT THE ECONOMICALLY DEPRIVED CHILD IS NOT DELAYED IN LANGUAGE ACQUISITION ALTHOUGH HE USES A QUALITATIVELY DIFFERENT LANGUAGE SYSTEM THAN THAT OF HIS MIDDLE CLASS AGE MATE. HIS LANGUAGE CONTAINS MANY FORMS THAT ARE IDENTICAL TO STANDARD ENGLISH (THIS ACCOUNTS FOR THE PRESENCE OF ALL THE RESPONSE TYPES OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL SENTENCE TYPES MODEL), BUT HIS LANGUAGE ALSO CONTAINS MANY STRUCTURES WHICH ARE CONSIDERED TO BE RESTRICTED FORMS WHEN COMPARED TO STANDARD ENGLISH. HOWEVER, THESE FORMS ARE NOT ONLY ACCEPTABLE IN LOWER CLASS NEGRO DIALECT BUT ALSO INDICATE A LEVEL OF SYNTACTIC DEVELOPMENT WHERE TRANSFORMATIONS ARE BEING USED APPROPRIATELY. THE LOWER CLASS NEGRO CHILD IS USING THE SAME FORMS AS THE LOWER CLASS NEGRO ADULT AND THEREFORE INDICATING THAT HE HAS LEARNED THE FORMS OF HIS LINGUISTIC ENVIRONMENT. (AUTHOR/DO)

ED020518

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEGRO PRESCHOOL CHILD

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY JOAN C. BARATZ

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

by

Joan C. Baratz
Center for Applied Linguistics
and
Edna Povich
Montgomery County Public Schools

June 1968

AL 001 298

Grammatical Constructions in the Language of the Negro Preschool Child

Joan C. Baratz

Center for Applied Linguistics

Edna Povich

Montgomery County Public Schools

Language samples of a group of economically disadvantaged children were analyzed using Lee's Developmental Sentence Types model. The transformations and restricted forms of these children were then compared with the results that Menyuk obtained for middle class preschoolers.

Results indicate that the economically deprived child is not delayed in language acquisition. The majority of his utterances are on the kernel and transformation levels of Lee's developmental model. The transformations and restricted forms that he uses are different from those used by middle class children. Although the Negro economically impoverished child has many forms in his language that resemble standard English, results indicate that he has a highly developed, highly structured linguistic system that is different from that of his middle class white agemate.

Grammatical Constructions and the Language of the Negro Preschool Child

Joan C. Baratz

Center for Applied Linguistics

Edna Povich

Montgomery County Public Schools

In the literature concerning the language of socio-economically disadvantaged children, their problems have been variously described as: 1) verbal destitution (i.e., they have not learned language), or 2) verbal underdevelopment (i.e., they have learned language incompletely, or 3) linguistically different (i.e., they have acquired a language system that is fully developed but different from standard English).

The purpose of the present study was to determine the languag development of a group of Head Start children, using Lee's (1966) Developmental Sentence Types and Menyuk's (1963) research on normal language acquisition as tools for language analyses. It was hoped that these tools would determine whether these children were deficient(i.e., verbally destitute or underdeveloped), or if their language was proficient (i.e., if they had acquired a well-formed language system).

Lee (1966) proposed a method of analyzing language samples that was based upon the work of Braine, Brown and Bellugi, McNeill and Chomsky. The Developmental Sentence Types model was an attempt to illustrate the progression that the child might go through from his early two-word combinations, to the use of the noun phrase, verb

phrase and other grammatical forms as independent elements or kernel sentences from which transformations will be derived.

Insert Table 1 about here

Menyuk (1963, 1964) used Chomsky's transformation analysis to describe language acquisition of normal and language delayed children. Her data revealed that children not only used transformations regularly by four and a half and five, but that they also used "restricted phrases" in a predictive lawful manner. This study attempted to compare the types and frequency of the transformations and restricted forms found in the speech of five year old Head Start children with those constructions that Menyuk found present in the speech of five year old white middle class children.

Procedure

Subjects. The subjects were twenty Negro children, ten boys and ten girls, who attended the Southwest Head Start Program in Washington, D.C. during the summer of 1966. The requirements for admission to this program were: 1) that the children's parents had an income of not more than $3,500 per year, 2) that the children lived in the southwest area of Washington, D.C., and 3) that the children would be five years old by November 1, 1966. All subjects had normal hearing, and were judged to be of at least normal intelligence by their classroom teacher. All had regularly attended the spring program and were between the ages of 5.0 and 5.6 with a mean age of 5.3 years.

Materials. The materials for this experiment consisted of two sets of pictures. Task I involved the ten pictures in the Children's Apperception Test --(CAT) (Bellak and Bellak, 1964). This test was originally designed to be used in psychological testing, however, the pictures have also been used as a means of eliciting language samples (Winitz, 1959, Minifie, et.al., 1963, Menyuk, 1964a). Task II involved a new test which was more specifically related to the experiences of the subjects. It was composed of a series of 8 x 10 black and white photographs of the subjects, the school and the project environment. Snapshots of the children at play, in their classrooms, and on the playground were taken by the experimenters. Activities within the school environment were also photographed, and at least one photograph included the picture of each subject.

Test administration. Before any testing was done or any photographs taken the examiner spent five days in the classrooms. It was hoped that by participating in all of the children's activities that the examiner would become more familiar to the children.

All testing was done in a separate room on the same hall as the classrooms. This was a quiet, bright room approximately 12' by 12'. It was furnished with a table and chairs. The tape recorder, a Wollensak 300, was on a chair in front of the table, with the microphone resting on the table.

The tasks were administered individually to all subjects. No subject received both tasks on the same day. Each subject was brought into the testing room by the examiner, who showed him the tape

recorder, explained what it was, and asked if the subject would like to hear himself on it. The tape recorder was then turned on and the following questions asked: 1) What is your name? 2) Where do you live? 3) How do you get to school every day? and 4) Do you have lots of brothers and sisters? This discussion was played back for the subject to hear. The purpose of this initial period was to establish rapport and to establish hearing oneself on the tape recorder as a reward for completing the experimental task. After this initial period, the examiner said: "Wasn't that fun? Would you like to hear yourself some more on this machine? I'm going to show you some pictures and I want you to tell me all about them. Then, when we're all finished, we can listen to you on the machine. O.K.? Good. Here's the first picture. What's happening in this picture?" The tape recorder was then turned on the timing begun. The experimental time was limited to five minutes per task. When the child stopped responding to the stimulus, the next picture was presented. Thus any one subject could have been asked to talk about from three to ten pictures depending upon how long he continued to respond to each picture.

Results

Responses. A total of 1403 responses were elicited from the twenty subjects under the two conditions. 750 of these were responses to the CAT cards and 653 were in response to the photographs. The mean number of responses per child was 70.2; the median was 75.

Lee's Developmental Sentence Types Model. In order to perform a qualitative analysis of the data, each subject's responses were analyzed according to Lee's Developmental Sentence Types (Lee, 1966). Lee's rules for using this construct were followed. Because this data differed somewhat from Lee's it was necessary to set up an additional analytical step. Many responses in this sample contained transformational forms that were not grammatically acceptable sentences in standard English. In her analysis, Lee placed all responses that were not grammatically acceptable on Level IV. Her sample, however, did not include a large percentage of "ungrammatical" responses with transformational modifications, as did the data in the present study. In the present study, responses that showed transformational modifications but which were not grammatically correct in terms of standard English, were not listed as complete sentences on the Emerging Transformational Level (Level V) but as Transformational Fragments which were incorporated into transformations.

Table 2 presents examples of each response type in the Developmental Sentence Types model as well as the percentage of occurence of each type for all subjects. Level V, Emerging Transformations, represents the bulk of the data, with a preponderance of the utterances on this level being classified as Transformational Fragments incorporated into transformations.

Insert Table 2 about here

Table 3 represents the percentage of subjects that used each response type. On Level I Two-Word Noun Phrases were used by 80% of the subjects: Two-Word Verbals by 65% and Fragments by 50% of the subjects. On Level II, no response type was used by 50% or more of the population studied. Level III Predicative Constructions and Verb Phrase Constructions were used by 75% of the subjects and Fragments by 70% of the subjects. Fifty-five percent of the subjects used Stereotyped Phrases on this level. The Actor-Action Sentence Transformations were used by 95% of the sample and Transformational Fragments by 100%. One word responses were made by 100% of the subjects.

Insert Table 3 about here

Transformations and Restricted Forms. All of the responses on the Emerging Transformational level of the Developmental Sentence Type were analyzed according to Menyuk's (1964a) list of transformation types and restricted forms.

Examples of all of the structures described by Menyuk that were found in the responses of the subjects studied in this experiment are presented in Table 4. All of the examples were taken from the responses of the subjects in this study. Menyuk does not always elaborate on the precise definition of some of the restricted and transformational categories that are found in her study: classification of the responses in this study were made on the basis of the experimenters' interpretation of her categories.

Insert Table 4 about here

Table 5 presents the transformations found in this study as compared with Menyuk's (1964a) study. There were several transformation types that were used solely by the white upper middle class kindergarten children tested with CAT cards by Menyuk. These were Passive, Separation, Auxiliary-Have, If, Participial Complement, Nominalization and Nominal Compound. Nominal Compound, Passive and Separation were used by almost all of the kindergarten children. However, Auxiliary-Have was used by only 19%, If by 21%, Participial Complement by 40% and Nominalization by only 28% of the kindergartners. Only two transformation types were identified that were used solely by the Head Start children. These were Auxiliary-Do and Adverb. Nineteen transformation types were used by at least 85% of the kindergartners, and only 8 transformations were not used by at least 50% of the children tested by Menyuk. In contrast, only 5 transformation types (Adverb, Auxiliary-Be, Contraction, Negation and Infinitival Complement) were used by more than 50% of the Head Start children.

Thus while the Head Start children used most of the transformation rules used by the kindergarten children, the percentage of Head Starters who used them is quite small as compared with the percentage of middle class white children who used these forms.

Insert Table 5 about here

Table 6 presents the percentage of occurrence of each restricted form. The restricted forms used by the kindergarten children and not by the Head Start children were: Article Redundancy and Substitution, Particle Omission, Inversion Restriction-Subject-Object, There Substitution, No Separation, Verb Form Redundancy and Noun Form Redundancy. However, the percentage of kindergartners who use these restricted forms was small. Restricted forms used by the Head Start sample were: Possessive, Pronoun First Person, Adverb Restriction, Auxiliary Restriction, Because and So Substitution and If Omission. All of these were used by a small percentage of the subjects except for Auxiliary Omission which was used by 95% of the Head Start children, and was the most frequently occurring restricted form for this group.

Insert Table 6 about here

The most frequently occurring restricted form for the kindergarten children was Contraction Deletion which was used by 48% of Menyuk's subjects. The next most frequently occurring restricted form was Inversion Restriction Verb Number. These restricted forms were used by a very small percentage of the Head Start children. The remaining restricted forms found for the kindergarten children occurred very infrequently.

In contrast there were 7 restricted forms that were used by 50% or more of the Head Start children. These were Auxiliary Omission (95%), Noun Phrase-Omission (90%), Article Omission (70%),

Conjunction Restriction (65%), Verb Phrase Substitution (55%), Preposition Omission (50%) and Verb Phrase Omission (65%). All of these restricted forms were used by very few of the kindergarten children, while Auxiliary Omission and Conjunction Restriction were not found at all in the kindergarten transcripts.

Discussion

Developmental Sentence Types. Lee's Sentence Types appears to be an adequate framework for analyzing language samples of this type, since it was possible to classify all utterances of the Head Start children within the Developmental Sentence Types model.

Wile all response types were found, the frequency of the Noun Phrase Predicative Construction, Designative Construction as well as the sentences and transformations that develop from them was a small percentage of the total number of responses. The Verb Phrase Construction and its successive forms were the most frequent fully "grammatical" in the sense of standard English forms. This could be due to the phenomenon that Bernstein (1959) observed in lower class language, i.e. "the use of grammatically simple, often unfinished sentences stressing the active voice." However, a more likely explanation may be found in the nature of the stimuli. The pictures used were all action pictures and the children naturally talked about what was going on in them.

The small percentage of Noun Phrases that occurred was not considered to be significant because the majority of constructions and sentences on other levels included the Noun Phrase or a pronoun to stand for a Noun Phrase. The small number of Noun Phrases, Designative Sen-

tences, Predicative Sentences and their Emerging Transformations seems to indicate that while these children are using what appear to be standard English forms, these forms represent only a small percentage of their language structure; the majority being a different kind of structure that could only be classified as transformational fragments when one uses Lee's model which is based on standard English.

If one accepts the assumptions of some of the earlier research that there is linguistic underdevelopment in lower class Negro speech, then one would expect to find the majority of responses of the children in this study to be on the first three levels. But this was not the case. Rather, 59.7% of the responses occurred on Levels IV and V, 47.3% of which were on Level V, the Emerging Transformation level. In addition, 100% of the subjects used responses on Level V. These results indicate that the lower class child is not functioning at an "underdeveloped" or "retarded" level of syntactic development, but that he is operating on a level appropriate to his age.

Analysis of Emerging Transformations. The largest number of responses occurred on Level V, the Emerging Transformational level which would indicate that the children are operating on a high level of syntactic development. When one examines the responses on Level V, however, it appears that the largest percentage of responses on this level, (and for the total of all responses) was Transformational Fragments incorporated into transformations. The fact that these Transformational Fragments are not randomly distributed; 95% of the children use the Auxiliary Omission, 65% of the children use the Conjunction

Restriction and 40% of the children use Auxiliary Restriction supports the view of some linguists (Stewart, 1964; Dillard, 1966) that the language used by these children is well-formed, but is simply different from middle class standard English. Thus, many Head Start utterances will be quantified incorrectly as "Fragments" because they are not "well-formed" in terms of middle class standard English patterns. However, if adult Negro dialect were used as the basis for judgment (and the Negro dialect is the language in the child's environment, and the language that he is developing) then many "restricted" forms would have to be reclassified. For example, Verb Form Omission as in When your sister come home, don't let her see nothin' would have to be reclassified as being an adult transformation in Negro Non-Standard speech, since in that code the rules governing addition or deletion of the third person verbal ending -s do not match those of the standard English, where the use of this verbal ending is obligatory. From the point of view of the Negro dialect, both she come and she comes are equally "normal", grammatical forms. In addition, the double negative in the example, don't let her see nothin', is a typical Negro Non-Standard usage (as it is in many languages such as French and Spanish), and as such should also be classified as an adult transformation rather than as a restricted form.

Comparison of the transformations used showed that the Head Start children used most of the types that the kindergarten children did, but that there were some transformations that the Head Start children did not use at all. The difference between the Head Starters and the kindergartners did not appear to be one of developmental level, but

rather one involving the nature of the responses to be categorized as transformations or as restricted forms. The majority of the kindergarten responses were examples of transformation types, whereas the majority of the Head Start responses contained "restricted transformations" when standard English was the criterion upon which judgments were based. Only two transformations (Adverb and Auxiliary-Do) were used solely by the Head Start children.

The fact that the largest number of responses occurred at Level V would indicate that the children were operating on a high level of syntactic development. However, when one examines the responses on Level V, it appears that the largest percentage of responses on this level were Transformational Fragments incorporated into transformations. Comparisons of the restricted forms used by the Head Start children and Menyuk's subjects showed the greatest difference between the two groups. Those restricted forms used by the kindergartners were rarely used by Head Starters and the most frequently used forms of the Head Start children occurred rarely if at all in the kindergarten transcripts. Head Start children used different restricted forms than did the kindergarten children.

Albright and Albright (1958) suggested the adaptation of the techniques of descriptive linguistics in order to identify the specific nature and features of children's language. Lee's Developmental Sentence Types and the transformations and restricted forms listed by Menyuk are based on information that linguists have provided, but like previous analyses of language, they are based almost exclusively on the structure of standard English dialect. Language studies of the economically de-

prived child have used as their criterion of language development measurements based on the standard dialect because of an implicit assumption that non-standard dialect represents, at most, mere low- level modifications of standard English. Since it is most likely that the economically deprived Negro child is learning a different dialect from that of standard English, we must discern the competence in the language that these children are learning -- the language which is in their social environment -- if we wish to assess their language development. When we assess their language development by how well they have learned standard English, we are merely testing their abilities in a dialect that may be at most peripheral to their experience and linguistic environment. Therefore, we must first identify the characteristics of lower class Negro speech which the disadvantaged Negro child is learning.

Stewart (1965, 1967) and Dillard (1966) described some features of lower class Negro dialect: 1) It does not necessarily inflect the verb to show the grammatical difference between the simple present and the past tense. I see it could mean 'I see it' or I saw it', even though these tenses do exist as grammatical entities in the dialect; 2) It negates the present and past tenses differently. The negative for the present would be I don't see it, while the negative for the past would be I ain't see it; 3) It forms the possessive differently, so that he brother is the equivalent form for 'his brother', and de man hat is equivalent to 'the man's hat'; 4) The double negative is found in many constructions; 5) Structures like he good and dey over dere are normal forms in adult Negro dialect.

Stewart (1965) has pointed out that because there are similarities between the white and lower class Negro non-standard dialect, the two have been assumed to have the same deep structure. The differences were interpreted as errors, and many researchers have thus assumed that the lower class child was using a deficient form of standard English, rather than a different, highly structured language of his own.

If we take the research on Negro Non-standard that linguists have done, we see that the structures that they have described as typical structures of Negro adults speech have been classified via Menyuk's categories as restricted forms. The Double Negative, Possessive Restriction, Verb Phrase Omission, Verb Phrase Substitution, Tense Restriction and Auxiliary Restriction all can be seen as characteristic forms of adults Negro dialect rather than as restricted forms in standard English. These forms together represent 76% of all the restricted forms identified in this study. It is necessary for us to remember that although the Negro child's usage of the Double Negative (or for that matter the French child's use of the Double Negative) is to be regarded as evidence for language acquisition of a form that is present in the adult speech of his community, the middle class child who uses the Double Negative must have such a usage classified as a restricted form since the adults in his environment do not use that particular form.

If the Level V Fragment responses are to be considered as transformation types in Negro dialect as Stewart's work would suggest, then the number of transformation type responses is greatly increased for

the Head Start children, and the number of restricted forms greatly decreased. The proportion of transformations and restricted forms is then very similar to that for the kindergarten population, but the kind of transformations for each population is different.

Cutts (1963), Smiley (1964) and Green (1965) have pointed out that the values, attitudes and culture of the lower class are different from those of the middle class, and that the lower class has developed a different language. Thus, it is not valid to evaluate the language of one culture with the norms from the language of a different culture; only comparisons as to the similarities and differences between them can be made. For in turning the tables, if we retained the method of judging one system by another system's rules (a procedure which represents the "fatal flaw" in a great deal of the research on language of the economically disadvantaged), we would have to say that middle class children are "verbally destitute" or "underdeveloped" in language acquisition because there are nine forms (Auxiliary Omission, Preposition Restriction, etc.) which are used by Head Start children but that are not within the verbal repertoire of the middle class kindergartner! A linguistic analysis of the lower class language patterns which simply asks "What forms are being used to generate structures?" rather than one that asks "What forms look like standard English?" allows the researcher to view variations between lower class and middle class language structure as differences rather than as deficiencies.

Summary

Having analyzed the language samples of Negro Head Start children via Lee's (1966) Developmental Sentence Types and Menyuk's (1964) lin-

guistic classifications, this study has indicated that the lower class child is using a qualitatively different language system than that of his middle class age mate. His language contains many forms that are identical to standard English. This accounts for the presence of all the response types of the Developmental Sentence Types model. However, his language also contains many structures which are considered to be restricted forms when compared to standard English. These forms are not only acceptable in lower class Negro dialect, but also indicate a level of syntactic development where transformations are being used appropriately. The lower class Negro child is using the same forms as the lower class Negro adult, and therefore indicating that he has learned the forms of his linguistic environment.

Bibliography

Albright, R., and Albright, J. Application of descriptive linguistics to child language. J. Sp. & Hrg. Res., 1965, 1, 257-261.

Bellak, L. and Bellak, S., Children's Apperception Test (C.A.T.). Larchmont, N.Y., C.P.S., Inc., 1964.

Bernstein, B., A public language: some sociological implications of a linguistic form. Brit. J. Sociology, 1959, 10, 311-336.

Cutts, W. Reading unreadiness in the underprivileged. N.E.A.J., 1963, 52, 23-24.

Dillard, J.L., The Urban Language Study of the Center for Applied Linguistics., The Linguistic Reporter, 1966, 8, 1-2.

Green, W., Language and the culturally different. Eng. J., 1965, 54, 724-733.

Lee, L., Developmental sentence types: a method for comparing normal and deviant syntactic development. J.Sp. & Hrg. Dis., 1966, 31, 311-330.

Menyuk, P., Syntactic structures in the language of children. Child Develp., 1963, 34, 407-422.

--------- Syntactic rules used by children from preschool through first grade. Child Develp., 1964a, 35, 533-546.

--------- Comparison of grammar of children with functionally deviant and normal speech. J. Sp. & Hrg. Res., 1964b, 7, 109-121.

Minifie, F., Darley, R., and Sherman, D., Temporal reliability of seven language measures. J. Sp. & Hrg. Res., 1963, 6, 139-148.

Smiley, M., Research and its implications. In A. Jewett, J. Mersand and D. Gunderson, Improving English Skills of Culturally Different Youth. Wash. D.C., U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1964.

Stewart, W.A., Foreign language teaching methods in quasi-foreign language situations. Non-standard Speech and the Teaching of English, 1965, Wash. D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

---------- Urban Negro speech: sociolinguistic factors affecting English teaching. In R. Shuy (ed.) Social Dialects and Language Learning, 1964, National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.

---------- Sociolinguistics factors in the history of American Negro dialects. The Fla. For. Lang. Rep., 1967, 5, 4-5.

Winitz, H., Language skills of male and female kindergarten children, J. Sp. Hrg. Res., 1959, 2, 377-386.

Table 1
LEE'S DEVELOPMENTAL SENTENCE TYPES*

Level I 2-Word Combinations	2-Word Noun Phrase	2-Word Designative	2-Word Predicative	2-Word Verbal	2-Word Fragments	2-Word Stereotyped Phrases
Level II Noun Phrases	Noun Phrase					
Level III Constructions	(Noun Phrase incorporated into Constructions)	Designative Construction	Predicative Construction	Verb Phrase Construction	(Phrase Structure Fragments incorporated into Construction	Stereotyped Constructions
Level IV Kernel Sentences	Designative Sentence	Predicative Sentence	Actor-Action Sentence			(Stereotyped Constructions incorporated into Sentences)
Successive Levels Emerging Transformations	Interrogative "Wh" Question	Negative Conjunction	"Do" plus Negative Infinitival Complement	(Transformational Fragments incorporated into Transformations)		

Lee, L. Developmental Sentence types: a method for comparing normal and deviant syntactic structure. J.Sp. Hrg. Dis., 1966, 31, 311-330.

EXAMPLES AND PERCENTAGE OF OCCURRENCE OF EACH RESPONSE TYPE

	Noun	Designative	Predicative	Verbal	Fragments	Stereotyped Phrases
Level I	a monkey 3.1	dat lion .3		walks in 2.9	by the wolf 1.7	I 'onno .6
Level II	no more baby .7				chen let tails .2	
Level III		dat about two bears .5	a baby in a crib 2.5	open dat door 7.9	so he get 1.9	an' up an' down 5.0
Level IV		dat is dud ovah class 2.3	his name is Wesley .7	a lady talk to dah man 6.4	see tha's 3 little .4	tha's all I know 2.6
(Level V) Successive Levels		who's this .5	dat's not me dat's Deborah .3	an' Debby didn' know it was darktime 9.1	an tiger goin'a house an tiger got all burned up 36.7	I donno that one .2
One Word Responses 12.5						

Table 3

PERCENTAGE OF SUBJECTS USING EACH RESPONSE TYPE FOR TASKS I AND II

	Noun	Designative	Predicative	Verbal	Fragments	Stereotyped Phrases
Level I	80	20		65	50	5
Level II	30				15	
Level III		25	75	75	70	55
Level IV		40	30	80	20	25
Successive Levels (Level V)		40	25	95	100	
One Word Responses	100					

Table 4

TRANSFORMATIONS AND RESTRICTED FORMS USED BY HEAD START CHILDREN

Transformations	Example
Negation	she can't go outside
Question	don't you know about it?
Contraction	duh daddy's not gonna see dem
Inversion	when it's hot outside come back in uh house
Relative Question	who is tha ?
Imperative	an' Miss Rush said: get up on uh table
Pronominalization	there were two little girls in uh room one was washin' clothes an ironin' an' one was washin' dishes
Got	duh ghost is gonna get duh children
Ausiliary -- Be	I'm gonna knock everything down
Do	yeah but I don' know her name
Do	he wasn't doin' it
Possessive	dat's he muvver's high heels
Reflexive	I read duh book den I play wid duh house den I go by myself
Conjunction	den Janis got in hers an' Darrel got in his an' I was goin' to leave 'em
Conjunction Deletion	I would take duh skates away an' put 'em in duh closet
So	so she said: "good, good"
Because-causal	they couldn't even eat the bottles 'cause the bottles were glass
Pronoun in Conjunction	I tol' duh odder lady an' she should uh told you
Adjective	uh fever got him a new car
Relative Clause	I don' know what's here
Complement-Infinitival	I wanna hold it
Iteration	an' one girl was goin' over dere tuh tell he tuh put the flag down.
Adverb	when it's raining ou side come back in duh house

Table 4 (con't)

Restricted form		Example
Verb Phrase -	Omission	duh big bear an' duh liddle bear
	Redundancy	he was being mad
	Substitution	they sittin' down lookin' at T.V.
NounPhrase -	Omission	ain' got day no more
	Redundancy	an muvver and faver they went to bed
		tiger go in duh house and tiger got all burned up
Preposition-	Omission	he playin' duh hat
	Redundancy	I climb up on the tree
	Substitution	tiger runnin' at duh monkey
Article Omission		dey were playin' game
Double Negative		he don' ha' no coat at school
Contraction Deletion		he play like he a real gorilla
Inversion Restriction		dere's three bears pullin' on uh rope
No Question		who do' people are
Reflexive Third Person		dey gonna fall down hurt dereself
Tense Restriction		Roral Jones a ' uh bruver an' Dan was in duh drawer rockin' uh chair while Miss Rush was fixin' uh box
Pronoun Restriction		den den gonna fall
Adjective Restriction		one of dem girls is ironing
Relative Clause Restriction		an Debby didn't know it was darktime
Verb Form -	Omission	when your sista come in uh house, don' let her see nuttin'
	Substitution	I knows who dat is
Noun Form -	Omission	dere dis two bunny rabbit duh ghost gonna get duh bunny rabbit an' eat' em all up
	Substitution	three playin' balls an' two playin' cowboys an' one playin'wi' duh puzzle
Possessive		uh king sittin' down in uh king chair
Pronoun First Person		where me at?
Adverb Restriction		she doin' nufin'
Auxiliary Restriction		an' we was lookin' at duh movies an' Darrel was lookin' at duh movies an' I was laughin'
Conjunction Restriction		climb up duh tree try uh get dim
Auxiliary Omission		dey pullin' uh rope
		dey gonna fall back
Possessive Restriction		dey got dem things an day got dem budder an' its all gone

Tabe 4 (cont.)

Possessive Restriction	the monkey fall on he head
Because or So Substitution	he gonna get up in uh tree to the tiger won' eat him up
	he stay in house an nuver was beat him for he didn' go outside
If Omission	dey go way up dere dey go fall

Table 5

PERCENTAGE OF KINDERGARTEN AND HEAD START CHILDREN USING EACH TRANSFORMATION TYPE

Transformation	Kindergarten n = 48	Head Start n = 20
Passive	66	
Negation	100	55
Question	92	30
Contraction	100	70
Inversion	100	5
Relative Question	87	20
Imperative	89	25
Pronominalization	33	5
Separation	89	
Got	100	45
Auxiliary - Be	100	85
Have	19	
Do		25
Do	100	30
Possessive	100	35
Reflexive	66	10
Conjunction	100	25
Conjunction Deletion	89	40
If	21	
So	37	10

Table 5 - continued

Transformation	Kindergarten n = 48	Head Start n = 20
Cause	97	15
Pronoun in Conjunction	100	15
Adjective	100	45
Relative Clause	87	15
Complement		
Infinitival	100	50
Participal	40	
Iteration	17	5
Nominalization	28	
Nominal Compound	100	
Adverb		65

Table 6

PERCENTAGE OF KINDERGARTEN AND HEAD START CHILDREN USING EACH RESTRICTED FORM

Restricted Form	Kindergarten n = 48	Head Start n = 20
Verb Phrase		
Omission	13	65
Redundancy	15	5
Substitution	35	55
Noun Phrase		
Omission	21	90
Redundancy	17	15
Preposition		
Omission	15	50
Redundancy	17	10
Substitution	23	20
Article		
Omission	8	70
Redundancy	13	
Substitution	2	
Particle Omission	9	
Double Negative	2	35
Contraction Deletion	48	

Table 6 - continued

Restricted Form	Kindergarten n = 48	Head Start n = 20
Inversion Restriction		
Subject-Object	8	
Verb Number	40	5
No Question	2	15
There Substitution	4	
No Separation	2	
Reflexive Third Person	29	15
Tense Restriction	39	40
Pronoun Restriction	35	40
Adjective Restriction	13	15
Relative Clause Restriction	21	10
Verb Form		
Omission	29	45
Redundancy	19	
Substitution	13	15
Noun Form		
Omission	25	15
Redundancy	13	
Substitution	4	10

Table 6 - continued

Restricted Form	Kindergarten n = 48	Head Start n = 20
Possessive	5	
Pronoun First Person	15	
Adverb Restriction	25	
Auxiliary Restriction	40	
Conjunction Restriction	65	
Auxiliary Omission	95	
Possessive Restriction	15	
Because of So Substitution	5	
If Omission	10	